

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herewith. In Claim 1, the phrase “3 to 80 parts by weight of a resol phenolic resin (B1) or” has been deleted.

Claims 2-8 are canceled.

Upon entry of the above amendment, Claims 1 and 9-14 will be all the claims pending in the application.

Response to the Rejection of Claims 1 and 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,157,428 to Hammer (“Hammer”).

Hammer is relied upon as teaching compositions comprising 1-99 wt% of a copolymer of ethylene and an epoxy monomer and 1-99 wt% of a phenolic resin.

The present invention relates to a resin composition comprising 100 parts by weight of a copolymer of an epoxy group-containing monomer and an α -olefin and 3 to 150 parts by weight of a polyhydric phenol. The claimed resin composition exhibits strong adhesive qualities, excellent powder-molding properties and excellent storage stability. *See, e.g.*, page 2, lines 7-13, and page 36, line 9 to page 37, line 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hammer does not teach or suggest the presently claimed resin composition. Specifically, Applicants assert that Hammer does not teach a resin composition comprising 3-150 parts by weight of a polyhydric phenol.

Hammer teaches curable blends comprising: (I) a free radical polymerized copolymer consisting essentially of (a) ethylene, (b) carbon monoxide, (c) α -olefins, and (d) monomers

containing an epoxy group; and (II) an organic thermosetting resin, which is selected from the group consisting of phenolic resins, epoxy resins and melamine formaldehyde resins. *See, e.g.*, Claim 1 of Hammer.

Applicants submit that the presently recited “polyhydric phenol” component is different from component (II) of Hammer. Applicants further submit that Hammer contains no suggestion to use polyhydric phenol as an organic thermosetting resin.

Applicants note that the term “polyhydric phenol” refers to an aromatic hydroxy compound containing two or more hydroxyl groups in its molecule, which may include a dihydric phenol (*e.g.*, catechol, resorcline, hydroquinone, orcine, urushiol, bisphenol A, binaphthol and anthrahydroquinone), and a trihydric phenol (*e.g.*, pyrogallol, phloroglucin and hydroxyhydroquinone). *See* page 6, lines 11-28. Applicants further note that these compounds are clearly different from component (II) of Hammer.

Applicants note that Hammer discloses the polyhydric phenol resorcinol (*see* column 6, line 62), which is also known as resorcline. Applicants submit, however, that Hammer only teaches that resorcinol is used as a starting material for making component (II). Thus, the resorcinol is not blended directly with component (I) of Hammer. In the present invention, the polyhydric phenol is blended directly with a copolymer of ethylene and epoxy monomer.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Hammer fails to disclose the presently claimed resin composition. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 9 has been rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Hammer in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,378,450 to Ema et al. ("Ema").

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Hammer, in view of Ema, do not teach, suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. Applicants assert that neither Hammer nor Ema teach directly blending a polyhydric phenol with a copolymer of an epoxy-containing monomer and an α -olefin.

In view of the fact that neither Hammer nor Ema teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed resin composition, Applicants submit that the cited references do not render the invention obvious.

Applicants additionally note that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the teachings of Hammer, in view of Ema, in order to arrive at the claimed invention. Applicants further submit that neither Hammer nor Ema suggest a resin composition with strong adhesive qualities, excellent powder-molding properties and excellent storage stability. Thus, without the requisite motivation, the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/021,351

Q67751

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Patrick F. Gallagher
Registration No. 54,109

Date: May 17, 2004